

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
WORTHINGTON ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WORTHINGTON MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION
VIRTUAL MEETING
July 23, 2020**

The regular meeting of the Worthington Architectural Review Board and the Worthington Municipal Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present: Mikel Coulter, Chair; Thomas Reis, Vice-Chair; Kathy Holcombe, Secretary; Edwin Hofmann (Arrived at 7:02 p.m.); David Foust; Richard Schuster and Susan Hinz. Also present were Scott Myers, Worthington City Council Representative; Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building; and Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator.

A. Call to Order - 7:00 pm

1. Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance – Tom Reis
3. Approval of minutes of the July 9, 2020 meeting

Mr. Schuster moved to approve the minutes, and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All Board members voted, “Aye,” and the minutes were approved.

B. Architecture Review Board – New Business

1. Garage Bay Extension – **787 Oxford St.** (Ed and Chasity Hoffman) **AR 43-2020**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This Homestead style house was constructed in 1919 and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. Recent approvals by the ARB involved extending the deck; adding a pergola and fencing to the rear of the house; installation of a spa; and the addition of a pergola at the rear of the property.

An addition is now proposed to add a bay and pergola to the garage.

Project Details:

1. The applicant is proposing a 14’ wide x 21’2” deep addition to the detached garage on this property. The new bay is proposed west of the existing garage and would have a shed roof finished in a dark standing seam metal that would be similar in color to the asphalt shingles on the existing garage and house. Gray vinyl siding with darker trim is also proposed to match the existing. A single overhead door would be on the south side and a sliding glass door is proposed on the west side. A light would be above the garage door and two light

fixtures are shown beside the sliding door that would match existing fixtures on the garage. A window is proposed on the rear.

2. West of the new bay would be a 7'10" wide x 21'2" deep wood pergola to match the pergola at the rear of the house.
3. A variance would be needed for total accessory structure area due to the attached pergola and the pergola approved at the rear of the property last year.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

There are recommendations in the Worthington Design Guidelines for new outbuildings to use design cues from older nearby structures, including form, massing, roof shape, roof pitch and height, materials, window and door types and detailing. Try to create a new building compatible in appearance with the house it accompanies. Compatibility of design and materials, exterior details and relationships are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application, as the design and character were compatible with the existing garage and house.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar said a sanitary sewer line was discovered earlier in the day before the meeting, the same line which was discovered south of this property, and the Public Service Department said they would go out to verify the line next week. Any approval would be contingent upon what is found next week and if there is enough room for the proposed project. Mr. Hofmann recused himself from the Board for this application. Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Mrs. Chasity Kilburn, 787 Oxford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Foust said he had no problems with the project. Board members had no other questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Brown if there were any emails or outside callers and he said no.

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY EDWIN & CHASITY HOFMANN FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO CONSTRUCT AN ADDITION TO THE GARAGE AT 787 OXFORD ST. AND CONTINGENT UPON WHAT IS DISCOVERED BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE DEPARTMENT REGARDING THE UTILITY LINE, AS PER CASE NO. AR 43-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 43-2020, DATED JUNE 30, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Schuster seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Schuster, aye; Ms. Hinz, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Foust, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

2. Fence – **662 Hartford St.** (Lindsay McComas) **AR 44-2020**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This Farmhouse was built in the mid 1850's and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The house was remodeled and added onto in the late 1970's and early 1980's. The owners gained approval late last year to replace and expand the rear patio and add a seat wall.

This request is to install a fence in the rear yard.

Project Details:

1. New fencing is proposed to enclose the rear yard. Replacement of the existing shadowbox fencing running south from the house and along a portion of the south property line is part of the project. The new fencing would be in the same location and extend along the south to a point short of the rear property line to allow retention of trees and to keep a distance from the neighbors' driveway. A gate is proposed at the rear so the owners can maintain that area of their property. Along the north property line, the fence would also be away from the property line to allow retention of existing vegetation and would terminate at the northeast corner of the garage. A section of fence with a gate is proposed between the house and garage on the north side.
2. The proposed fencing would be 4' high split rail fence with a metal mesh attached to the inside.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Fences have long been used to mark property boundaries, to restrict access to properties by people and animals and for decorative purposes. They serve these traditional purposes in Worthington and can add to the character of a neighborhood when they are well executed and properly cared for. Fencing should be open in style; constructed with traditional materials; 3' to 4' in height; in the back yard; and of simple design, appropriate for the house style.

Consider using natural plant materials instead of fences. Various bushes and shrubs can be used to mark property lines or to set off private areas such as rear patios. Some of these may be evergreens; some may lose their leaves in the fall. Get good advice from a nursery or professional arborist about plant size, shape, rate of growth and care before choosing a natural fencing material.

Whether natural or man-made, all fencing materials require maintenance. Do not let plants get overgrown or full of litter; keep wood fences painted or coated with opaque stain; keep metal fences from rusting; and watch for mortar loss and other deterioration in masonry walls.

Recommendation:

Staff recommending approval of this application, as the proposed fence met the Design Guidelines in terms of location, height, openness, design, and materials.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Ms. Lindsay McComas, 662 Hartford St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Coulter wanted to state for the record that Mr. Hofmann had rejoined the Board for further discussions since recusing himself for the previous Agenda item. Board members had no questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Brown if there were any emails or outside callers and Mr. Brown said no.

Motion:

Mr. Foust moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY LINDSAY MCCOMAS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO INSTALL A FENCE AT 662 HARTFORD ST. AS PER CASE NO. AR 44-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 44-2020, DATED JULY 9, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Hofmann seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Ms. Hinz, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Schuster, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Foust, aye and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

3. Garage Door – 690 Evening St. (Chad Kiner) AR 45-2020 (Amendment to AR 04-2020)

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This house was built in the early 1900’s and is a two-story Colonial Revival style house. Approval was granted in 2015 and 2016 by the ARB to allow renovation of the house and replacement of the garage. Earlier this year the ARB approved plans to construct an addition at the rear of the garage that would function as an enclosed sport court.

This application would change the door to the addition.

Project Details:

1. The garage addition was approved to be 33’ wide, and ~31.6’ deep, located 10.2’ from the rear property line. On the north side Pella wood multi-slide patio doors with 8 full-light glass panels were proposed. The patio doors were to be 28’ wide and 8’ high.
2. Approval is now sought to install a 20’ wide by 8’ high glass and aluminum overhead door instead of the patio doors. The owner would like the aluminum to be black or white and the 24 tempered glass panels would be tinted.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

There are recommendations in the Worthington Design Guidelines for new outbuildings to use design cues from older nearby structures, including form, massing, roof shape, roof pitch and height, materials, window and door types and detailing. Try to create a new building compatible in appearance with the house it accompanies.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this application. Although the proposed glass door was not typical, it is in a location that is relatively hidden and seems fitting for the use. It may be appropriate to have the aluminum framing match the color of the tinted glass.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant, Mr. Chad Kiner, 690 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Kiner said the garage door would be facing north, and the glass will be slightly tinted which will provide some energy efficiency. He said he wanted his children to be able to push the button and have the garage door go up, instead of opening the doors wide themselves, and potentially injuring themselves. Mr. Reis asked Mr. Kiner if he had any objection to the framing being black since the window tint would be charcoal. Mr. Kiner said the actual color of the tinting would be lighter than what was shown in the photograph, and he wanted to have the black framing because it matched the hardware and light fixtures that were already on the house. Board members had no other questions or concerns. Mr. Coulter asked Mr. Brown if there were any emails or outside callers and Mr. Brown said no.

Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY CHAD KINER FOR APPROVAL TO AMEND CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS NO. AR 04-2020 WITH A CHANGE TO THE DOOR ON THE GARAGE ADDITION AT 690 EVENING ST., AS PER CASE NO. AR 45-2020, DRAWINGS NO. AR 45-2020, DATED JULY 9, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Hofmann seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Ms. Hinz, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; Mr. Schuster, aye; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Foust, aye and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

B. Architecture Review Board – Unfinished Business

Mr. Coulter moved to take the following Agenda item off the table, and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All Board members voted, “Aye.”

1. Security Lights – 137 E. Granville Rd. (Mark Goyer/Sharon Memorial Hall) AR 37-2020

This application was tabled without discussion at the July 9th meeting.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

This building was built as a residence in 1861 and used as such until 1946. After WWII, voters approved a War Memorial Levy and the building was purchased and dedicated as Sharon Memorial Hall in 1947. When zoning was established in 1971, the property was zoned R-10, Low Density Residence, which allows for single family dwellings and public and semi-public uses. Many community groups and organizations used the building until 1975, at which time the Sharon Township Trustees moved their offices and police department into the building. The Township moved its operations to E. Wilson Bridge Rd. in 2009 and the building was renovated. Attempts were made by the Sharon Memorial Board, the entity responsible for Sharon Memorial Hall, to find public and semi-public users for the building that would generate revenue and allow maintenance of the building and site. After no users were found, the VM, Veterans Memorial zoning district was created in 2010, the property was rezoned from R-10 to VM, and the space was leased to small office users. Sharon Memorial Hall is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District.

Two security lights were replaced that did not receive approval from the Architectural Review Board.

Project Details:

1. This is a request to retain the security light fixtures that were installed on the east and west sides of the building. The lights were installed in June of 2019 in place of fixtures that had not worked for about 15 years.
2. The new fixtures are LED with 3500 Lumens and 5000K in color.
3. There have been no neighbor complaints about the new lights, and it is felt by tenants and others the area feels more secure.

Land Use Plans:Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance

Keep lighting at a pedestrian scale along the streetscape. Avoid lighting fixtures mounted high above the ground. Avoid excessive brightness. In recent years great care has been taken by the ARB to assure newly installed lighting fixtures are not overly bright and that the light source is not visible from the right of way.

Compatibility of design and materials, exterior detail and relationships, and window treatment are standards of review in the Architectural District ordinance.

Recommendation:

Although the installed fixtures are designed and situated so the light sources are visible, and the lights are a bright white color, there are only two lights and residential neighbors are not bothered. A different style fixture that is angled toward the ground or warmer bulb color may be more appropriate, but the change may not be necessary in this situation.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant Mr. Mark Goyer, representing 137 E. Granville Rd., Worthington, Ohio, said when they realized the security lights they already had were not working,

they hired a contractor to switch out the bulbs, but they discovered the fixtures were inoperable. Mr. Goyer said they asked the contractor to match the fixture and the light as close as possible to what was there previously, and they have not received any complaints from anyone. He said he believed the one complaint that was received was not even from a Worthington resident, but he did not know if that would make a difference or not.

Mr. Hofmann asked if the lights have already been replaced or if the lights were still not working. Ms. Valerie Kerbler said the light fixtures were replaced on June 21st, 2019. Mr. Hofmann asked how the lights worked, if the lights were constantly on, or if the lights only come on after detecting motion. Ms. Kerbler explained the lights come on at dusk and go off when daylight begins. She said the lumens were a little brighter because they needed to light up the driveway. Mr. Hofmann asked Mrs. Bitar if it was normal to keep security lights on all night and Mrs. Bitar explained this is an unusual location because it is in the middle of residential area. She said commercial properties do have security lights on all night, and they have not received any complaints from the adjacent neighbors about the lights.

Mrs. Holcombe said she agreed this is a safety issue, and because they replaced what was already there, and there have not been any complaints from the neighbors, she thought the lights were fine.

Mr. Foust said he had a different opinion. He said he drove past the location at night and felt the lights were highly visible from both directions on State Route 161. Mr. Foust felt the lights were brighter than what would be allowed in a commercial parking lot. He said he understood the neighbors have not complained, but the Board went through a similar discussion with the Worthington Inn about a year ago when they wanted security lighting along side of their building and two things came out of that. One they ended up with up and down lighting without showing the light source and the Board also made them relocate the conduit next to the down spouts because the conduit was not highly visible. Mr. Foust said he felt the lights were wrong for the building and wrong for the residential environment and something different should be considered. Mr. Schuster said he agreed with Mr. Foust, and that the lights were too bright for the area. He said he understood there have not been any complaints by the neighbors but if the applicant had asked for permission before installing the lights, he felt permission would not have been granted for those fixtures. Mr. Coulter asked if the conduit was already existing, and if only the light fixture was changed. Mr. Goyer said the conduit was already existing, and he was not sure if any of the wiring was replaced or not and referred that question to Ms. Kerbler. Ms. Kerbler confirmed all the wiring had to be replaced because the old wiring had rotted and that is why their bill was so high. Mr. Coulter asked if the current lamp inside the fixture could be replaced with something that is a little warmer in color and not as bright. Mr. Hofmann suggested using a different light fixture such as a goose neck lamp and have the fixture lowered for just lighting the pathway, such as below the header elements of the windows. He said a new LED fixture should not be that expensive, otherwise changing the bulb and the amount of light output would be okay. Mr. Goyer said the lights were placed where they were to cover a broad area to include the parking lot. Mr. Coulter said to do what Mr. Hofmann suggested, a second light would have to be added on each side of the building. Mr. Goyer said he was okay with making a change to the fixture, but he wanted to know exactly what fixtures would be allowed, and then he would just make the change.

Mr. Foust clarified his biggest issue was the amount of light that was visible from State Route 161, and he would like to see the light shielded downward. He did not have any issues with the conduit.

Mrs. Kerbler requested to table the application. Mr. Hofmann moved to table the application and Mr. Reis seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye."

2. **Stafford Village Redevelopment including Demolition of Buildings – Northeast Corner of Hartford St. and Stafford Ave.** (pH7 Architects/National Church Residences) **AR 14-2019**

&

C. Municipal Planning Commission

Mr. Schuster moved to take the following Agenda item off the table, and Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye."

1. Planned Unit Development – Final Plan

- a. **Stafford Village Redevelopment – Northeast Corner of Hartford St. and Stafford Ave.** (pH7 Architects/National Church Residences) **PUD 01-2019F**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

Stafford Village was developed in the early 1970's and is entirely owned by National Church Residences. The main part of the apartment complex is at the northeast corner of E. Stafford Ave. and Hartford St. Other units are located further to the north, and at the southwest corner of North and Hartford Streets. Also, houses at 862, 868 and 874 Hartford St. are owned by National Church Residences.

National Church Residences was rezoned to a Planned Use District (PUD) on February 18, 2020 and is now continuing to the next phase of the development process for a PUD. We will be reviewing the following applications: PUD - Final Plan, Architectural Review, and a Subdivision.

The proposal is to re-develop the main portion of the complex, which is on approximately 3-acres and currently contains 58 dwelling units, as a new senior housing development with 86-units of senior housing. The project will include 85-units in the new two to three story building that will be constructed. Of those 85 new units, 34-units of affordable housing were approved for a 30-year period. There are currently 10 buildings on the site, seven multi-tenant buildings and three existing single-family homes along Hartford St. All three of the single-family houses on Hartford St. are included in the PUD and are contributing buildings in the Worthington Historic District. The southern house is the only structure to remain, as the northern two houses (868 & 874 Hartford St.) are to be demolished as part of this redevelopment.

Application History:

- February 14, 2019 – The Municipal Planning Commission and the Architectural Review Board reviewed and tabled the proposal for the site where the applicant received feedback from the Commission & Board and the general public.
- February 28, 2019 – The Municipal Planning Commission and the Architectural Review Board reviewed and tabled the proposal for the site where the applicant received feedback from the Commission & Board and the general public.
- April 30, 2019 and May 2, 2019 – Members of the Municipal Planning Commission and the Architectural Review Board did a walking tour of the property.
- December 12, 2019 – The Municipal Planning Commission and the Architectural Review Board reviewed and tabled the proposal for the site where the applicant received feedback from the Commission & Board and the general public.
- January 9, 2020 – The Municipal Planning Commission recommended approval of the rezoning to City Council by a 4 to 1 vote and the Architectural Review Board tabled the Architectural Review application pending approval of zoning by City Council.
- February 3, 2020 – City Council introduced legislation to rezone the property to a PUD and set a public hearing date.
- February 18, 2020 – City Council reviewed and approved the rezoning of the property to a PUD by a 5 to 2 vote at to allow for the redevelopment of the property.
- April 20, 2020 – This is the effective date of the zoning since there is a 60-day referendum period after a property has been rezoned.

Project Details:

1. Demolition of Buildings

The Architectural Review Board is needed for the demolition of seven (7) multi-family buildings and two (2) single-family homes as part of the redevelopment of Stafford Village that was approved by City Council.

868 Hartford Street – To be demolished

This 1 ½-story vernacular style home with a detached garage was constructed in 1929 and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District. The home received ARB approval in the past for several projects including a major renovation and addition to the home in 1990 and 1996.

874 Hartford Street – To be demolished

This one-story vernacular style home with a detached garage was constructed in 1940 and is a contributing building in the Worthington Historic District, however it is believed that this house was actually two separate houses from the mid 1800's and were combined and moved to this location in 1940.

Stafford Village – To be demolished

There are 7 one-story brick cape cod influenced buildings that were constructed in 1970. These buildings are not contributing buildings in the Worthington Historic District.

2. Allowable Uses

- a. Senior Citizen Development
 - i. Senior Residential – means multi-family facilities with occupancy restricted to age 55 and over. Social rooms, limited staff and garages may be included. Unit sizes also vary and be as large as typical apartments.
 - ii. Facility programming space throughout the interior to accommodate a full range of congregate services, dining, health, and wellness.
- b. Single-family residential

3. Updates

The following is a list of the development details that have been updated:

- Siding colors have been updated. The ochre color has been replaced with a historical pale yellow.
- The courtyard design and landscaping have been clarified. Paving and plant materials have been improved and updated.
- The eastern courtyard along E. Stafford Ave. has been adjusted on the ground floor to reflect an enlarged dining room on first floor.
- The western courtyard along Hartford St. has been enhanced with an arbor structure and additional plantings to create a private outdoor space for the residents.
- Emergency access drive will be paved asphalt with a small portion in the area in front of a control gate being a heavy-duty cobblestone. The 5' high control gate will manually swing open and is to be constructed of wood painted white.
- Bollards with a removable chain and hanging signage will be on the east end of the emergency access drive.
- Internal circulation related to the garage has been updated to reflect a one-way entrance on the eastern side of the building with a one-way exit on the north side of the building that will then be directed east back through the parking lot.
- In coordination with the City Arborist, several trees along E. Stafford Ave. are shown to be removed related to the condition of the trees. These were identified as possible trees that might need to be removed when we were going through the rezoning process. The landscape plans have been updated to reflect additional street trees along the public right-of-way and within the courtyards.

4. Character & Design

a. Buildings:

The project is designed as one large building with a façade that gives the look of many connected separate buildings with varying architectural styles, many of which are found in Worthington. The 3-story portion of the building will be confined to the central part of the site with the 2-story portions are now located around the periphery to be more compatible in scale to the surrounding homes.

A variety of roof shapes would hide the flat roof behind that would house the condensing units and other mechanical equipment for the building. All rooftop mechanicals will be screened from public view.

Needed:

- Clarification needed on the number of condensing units and air handling units.

The units along the street rights-of-way would have exterior entrances and porches with walkways leading from the public sidewalk. Interior entrances are also proposed for those units, as well as the other units in the building. Several of the eastern units along E. Stafford Ave. will be able to have zero-step entry into the units. Walks are proposed around much of the perimeter of the building. The main entrance to the building will be accessed from the resident parking lot. Other entrances would be at various locations on the exterior and in the garage. Two courtyard areas are proposed on the E. Stafford Ave. frontage that would help to add relief to the south side of the building and add gathering areas for the residents. Walkways are proposed to connect to these areas from the public sidewalk.

Predominant building materials will be brick, cementitious fiberboard, standing seam and asphalt shingles.

Along the street frontage of the site, the structure would be a 2-story building, with placement increasing from 17' to 21.3' from Hartford St. (excluding porches) and increased around the preserved Sycamore tree, and 20' from E. Stafford Ave. (excluding porches). The center section of the building that is proposed to be a 3-story building and has been pushed back from the streets to the middle of the site, with the first floor of the center of the building being structured covered parking. Parking is also proposed on a surface lot at the northeast area of the site.

b. Site:

The main vehicular entrance to the site would be from E. Stafford Ave., with an emergency access planned to Hartford St. The emergency access will be asphalt with a heavy-duty cobblestone approach between the sidewalk and the gate. The drive will have a gate that will prohibit vehicles from entering the site from Hartford St. and there will be bollards with a chain across the access drive that would prohibit the residents from using this emergency drive, but can easily be moved by the Division of Fire if needed. The Division of Fire reviewed and approved the emergency access drive with a gate and chain with the condition that the emergency access drive is to be maintained year-round. This would include the removal of snow. The Division of Fire has also asked that signage be installed along the north side of the development prohibiting parking in this area so that it would not create an issue for the Division of Fire if there was an emergency.

Needed:

- Additional signage is needed along the northern portion of the site that would prohibit parking in this area and that would direct the residents now exiting the garage to make a right-turn only upon exiting the garage. An additional do not enter sign is needed to prohibit residents and visitors from trying to exit by utilizing the emergency access drive along the northern side of the development.
- Guarantee that the emergency access drive will be maintained at all times and be clear of snow in case of an emergency.

- Clarification on the exact location of the gate.

Bicycle parking locations are shown along E. Stafford Ave., with bicycle racks being inverted “U” style as shown on Sheet C-13.

In addition to parking lot trees, other trees and shrubs are proposed around the site. East of the drive and adjacent to the surface parking on the east side two sections of 3’ high walls are proposed to screen cars from the residential neighbors. The plan calls for a mix of 4’ to 6’ high fencing with landscaping around the perimeter of the site. A combination of fencing and screening is not uncommon in Old Worthington to provide screening of a parking areas from neighboring residents.

Needed:

- Material and detail for walls.
- Clarification on whether the proposed fencing will be painted or left natural. Staff’s preference would be to leave it natural.

There are three separate courtyards for the residents to enjoy. The larger courtyard for the residents is located behind the existing single-family home on Hartford St. that is to remain. This courtyard will have a seating area and arbor for the residents. The other two courtyards face E. Stafford Ave.

c. Lighting:

The following language was added to the Development Text stating that all decorative light poles shall be no higher than 12-feet, and the concrete bases shall not be exposed for public sidewalk pedestrian lighting. Light color shall be 2,700 K or less. Light level shall be zero-foot candles at the property line.

Needed:

- Information is needed for the lighting shown on Sheet C-13 and Sheet C-20.

d. Signage:

One monument sign is now shown west of the access drive entrance on Stafford Avenue and a projection sign attached to the building at the corner of Hartford St. and E. Stafford Ave. and originally shown attached to the building by the access drive off of E. Stafford Ave.

Needed:

- Clarification needed on the location and number of projection signs. Sheet D-9
- Revised signage material is needed. The proposed signage does not meet the Design Guidelines for materials and does not meet the requirements found in the Sign Code for number of colors. Sheet D-9

5. Infrastructure:

a. Stormwater:

Stormwater will be handled by catch basins located throughout the site that will direct the stormwater to underground retention. The underground detention is located under the main access drive from E. Stafford Ave., parking lot area and the emergency access drive area. Sheet D-6, Sheet C-2 and C-3 show the location of the underground retention. The final design is currently being reviewed by MS Consultants. Preliminary design has been approved by the Service & Engineering Department and MS Consultants.

Needed:

- An Operation & Maintenance Plan will be required and will need to be recorded with the Franklin County Recorder. Final design will need to be approved prior to recording the Final Plat and receiving permit approval for construction.

b. Sanitary Sewer:

There is an existing 12” sanitary sewer line that runs east to west through the middle of the property. As part of the redevelopment of this site, the applicant will be vacating the old sanitary sewer easement and platting a new 12” sanitary sewer line that will be located in a new 20’ wide easement. This will be handled as part of the Subdivision process. The new building will connect by a 6” sanitary service line to an existing 8’ sanitary line along Hartford St.

Needed:

- The sanitary sewer line has been misidentified on several sheets. The plans referencing storm versus sanitary need to be corrected.

c. Central Water:

The new building will connect by a new 3” domestic waterline in addition to a 6” for fire sprinklers for the building that connects from an existing 6” waterline along Hartford St.

d. Traffic & Parking:

A Traffic Impact Study was submitted and approved by the City Engineer and the City’s traffic consultant Carpenter Marty. Access to the property shall be along the southeast from Stafford Ave. with an emergency access to Hartford St. north of the proposed building. Service and delivery to the property is limited to the Stafford Ave. access point. Parking will be completely screened from Hartford St. and Stafford Ave. The covered garage parking will accommodate 53 parking spaces with an additional uncovered 32 parking spaces for a total of 85 spaces. Bicycle racks are shown at three separate locations along E. Stafford Ave.

e. Natural Features:

A Tree Preservation Plan and new detailed Landscape Plan are included in the materials submitted by the applicant. The detailed Landscaping Plan can be viewed on Sheet C-10, Sheet C-14 to C-17 and Sheet C-19 shows the landscaping in addition to the proposed fencing. A tree protection plan is included primarily for the protection of the 56’ Pin Oak and 46” Sycamore will be required during construction. City Council agreed to reduce the Fee in Lieu of payment for caliper inch replacement to \$57,900.00.

Needed:

- The Fee in Lieu of payment will be required to be paid prior to receiving a permit to start construction.

f. Public Area Payment:

The Public Area Payment will be \$250/dwelling unit (\$21,250.00).

Needed:

- The Public Area Payment will be required to be paid prior to receiving a permit to start construction.

g. Amenities:

There will be three accessible courtyards as part of this development. Two of the courtyards are along the south side of the buildings facing E. Stafford Ave. that will provide outdoor seating, decorative waste receptacles and decorative pedestrian lighting.

h. Public Amenities:

The development will be providing the following:

- Decorative benches and brickwork along E. Stafford Ave.
- Bicycle racks along E. Stafford Ave.
- New sidewalks along Hartford St. and E. Stafford Ave. at 5' in width.
- Freestanding decorative lighting fixtures will be finalized with the Architectural Review Board application.
- Additional street trees along Hartford St. and Stafford Ave. where needed.

6. Construction Timeline

Construction will begin in 2021 and continue for approximately 18 months in one single phase.

7. Covenants and other restrictions which will be imposed upon the use of the land, buildings, and structures

- The applicant is the owner of record for the property.
- Ordinance #07-2020 approved the PUD Development Plan and Development Text to permit 86-units for senior housing. There will be 85-units in the new building with 34 of those units designated as affordable.
- Resolution 09-2020 approved by City Council gave the City Manager the authority to enter into an agreement with National Church Residences that requires that there be 34-units of affordable housing units for a 30-year fixed period.

Needed:

- The Agreement still needs to be signed prior to recording the Final Plat and receiving permit approval for construction.

Land Use Plans:

Worthington Design Guidelines and Architectural District Ordinance:

Demolition:

The Board shall determine by a vote of its members whether to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness based on the determination:

- That such building is not historically or architecturally significant;
- That if the building is found to be historically or architecturally significant, there is no feasible or prudent alternative or change that would allow preservation of the building; and
- The proposal for grading, landscaping and other design treatment once the structure is removed meets the standards of this chapter.

In any circumstance, the Board shall not deny a request for a certificate of appropriateness if it determines either:

- That such denial will deny all reasonable use of the property or
- That such denial shall result in an unsafe condition because of the structural or physical condition of the building.

New Development:

- New commercial/institutional development sites generally are larger than existing sites and may involve one large or many smaller land parcels. They might include land that has never been developed, or that has some existing development that could be removed for new development.
- These sites often have natural and man-made features that serve as enhancements to a development or that blend in with the existing built environment of the city. Natural features include watercourses, distinct topography, and mature trees. Man-made features include fences, stone walls, gardens and plantings, and historic buildings. Planning for the development of a new site should include an inventory and evaluation of features, and the development should retain those that add scenic or historic value or that help integrate the new development into the existing cityscape.
- Connecting new development with what has come before is an important consideration. In the past, new commercial development tended to extend the urban fabric, building at the edges of existing development. Most development after the mid-20th century, which had an automobile orientation, went to the edge of town and grew as separate shopping centers or individual buildings with little to connect them physically.
- In Worthington, new developments should build upon and extend the pedestrian scale and walkability of the city's commercial heart. Efforts to establish this connection can include multiple pathways to existing streets, following traditional grid street patterns in commercial developments, and extending amenities such as sidewalks, lawns and shade trees into new developments.
- Scale refers to the apparent size of a building and its components in relation to the size of a human being and in comparison to adjacent buildings. Buildings are often referred to as being either grand or intimate in scale. The city of Worthington, with few exceptions, expresses an intimate scale – especially in Old Worthington's Central Business District – that contributes to a sense of comfort and friendliness attractive to residents or visitors.
- Form and massing are related concepts. The combination of various geometric forms leads to the overall massing of a building. A rectangular wing attached to a square

building, for example, might result in a T-shaped or L-shaped form. In Old Worthington, the form and massing of every building is not always apparent because there are so many shared walls. Generally, commercial and institutional buildings in this area are rectangular in form, with a simple massing as a result. Some properties, such as churches, have wings or additions that made their massing more complex.

- New construction in Old Worthington should take special care to employ scale, form, and massing that are similar to and compatible with existing building designs. To maintain the predominant sense of scale in Old Worthington, most buildings should be two stories in height; in some instances, two-and-a-half stories may be appropriate but this must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Rectangular forms and simple massing, designed to resemble the characteristics of existing buildings, are the most appropriate in Old Worthington.
- Any construction of new commercial buildings should maintain the same setback as adjacent buildings. Retention of the area's continuous commercial facades is a high priority. In designing new institutional structures, study existing buildings of this type. Select a setback that is consistent with code requirements but that also is appropriate for the size, shape and scale of the new structure.
- In Old Worthington, many roofs are flat, but there also are gable and mansard roofs. This variety in roof shape helps give the area its character. Outside Old Worthington there is a similar variety in newer commercial and institutional structures. New infill structures should employ roof shapes typical of Old Worthington and selected specifically for compatibility with the roof shapes of immediately adjacent structures. Roof heights of new buildings should approximate those of existing buildings and should not be significantly higher or lower.
- Brick is the predominant building material in Old Worthington, but wood can also be found. Traditionally, these were the materials used by builders in downtown districts. There are some modern materials, but the historic ones are the most apparent; some of the brick has been painted and some remains unpainted. New buildings in this area should employ only traditional wood and brick. Contemporary materials that simulate wood can be acceptable if done well, and brick veneer construction over a wood frame also is acceptable. Observe existing historic buildings to see how materials are used: brick patterns; types of wood surfaces; and decorative uses of these materials in wall surfaces. Consider using similar techniques to provide visual interest and variety in a new building.
- Windows in commercial/institutional buildings are important elements in architectural compositions. This is especially so in the case of commercial storefront windows, which create a connection between the interior of a retail space and the exterior space outside. Upper floor windows are also important, since they help define the pattern of solids and voids along the streetscape. This is particularly true in Old Worthington, where these patterns have long been a part of the area's character. New buildings built in Old Worthington should follow traditional window patterns on the first and the upper floors. Traditional storefront design should prevail on the first floor, with individual windows on upper floors. Observe the size, proportions, and spacing of storefront and upper floor windows on Old Worthington buildings. Use these as a guide in developing a new building design to enhance the new structure's compatibility with existing buildings. For new buildings, simple 1 over 1 double-hung sash are the most appropriate (and usually

least expensive) for upper floor use. Avoid multiple-paned effects and ornamental windows such as stained glass.

- Doors and the entrances surrounding them -- entries -- are significant elements in a building design. Traditionally they were focal points of building facades, often located symmetrically and made easily visible so it was readily apparent where people should enter a building. More recent building designs often downplay the entry to the point that it becomes simply a slight variation in a continuous facade. In new infill construction, follow traditional door and entrance design that can be found throughout Old Worthington. Entries may be symmetrically or asymmetrically placed; doors should be solid wood or glazed in the upper half. Simple trim around the entrance will help distinguish it as the point of entry to the building. Simple paneled doors are the most appropriate; avoid heavily ornate doors.
- Ornamentation makes a building more visually appealing and distinguishes it from other structures. Worthington's commercial buildings display ornamentation trends from the early 19th century to the early 20th. This was a period of increasingly ornate ornamentation as the 19th century progressed and increasing simplicity during the early 20th century. The variety of ornamentation and detail in Old Worthington shows how much variety could be achieved among buildings that otherwise were fairly plain and followed traditional commercial design concepts. Observe Worthington's historic architecture for information on the kinds and amounts of ornamentation employed on various commercial/institutional building styles and periods. When designing a new commercial building in Old Worthington, use ornamentation conservatively. Use it in traditional locations around windows and doors and along the cornice. Use simple forms to create ornamentation. A reflection or simulation of complex 19th century ornamentation usually is more successful than trying to duplicate the actual appearance. Sometimes just a little ornamentation can have a major impact.
- Color can have a significant impact upon a building's design and appearance, and the Architectural Review Board encourages the use of colors appropriate to the buildings and the overall character of Worthington. There is a policy of flexibility in color use, and the Board can provide information on appropriate selections. There are no hard and fast requirements for particular colors or color combinations. Once again, however, it will be instructive to study Worthington's existing commercial/institutional building stock to get a sense of appropriate colors and combinations of colors. Avoid removing paint from older painted brick walls, since paint removal processes can damage soft older bricks. Unpainted brick walls should remain unpainted, the better to reflect their historic character. In general, avoid bright colors not typical on Worthington commercial buildings. For new infill buildings select colors compatible with those already used along the streetscape. Most buildings use light colors for the building body and darker colors for the trim. Following this pattern is encouraged. Avoid using too many colors. Usually one body color and one trim color are sufficient.

PUD Final Plan Submission Requirements:

(a) After approval by the City Council of the PUD Ordinance and prior to beginning construction of each phase of the development, Final Plans addressing one or more phases of the proposed development shall be submitted to the Municipal Planning Commission. At the time of filing each Final Plan application, the applicant shall pay a fee of two-hundred dollars (\$200.00), no part of

which shall be refundable. No Final Plan shall be approved until the effective date of said Ordinance.

(b) Final Plan submittals shall include the following:

- (1) An exhibit showing which phases of the Preliminary Plan are part of the proposed Final Plan;
- (2) An updated construction schedule;
- (3) All items required in the Preliminary Plan, revised as necessary to meet the approved PUD Ordinance;
- (4) Proposed final design and location of Structures, Accessory Structures, streets, drives, Sidewalks or Recreation Paths, parking, entry features, site lighting, landscaping, screening and other features as required by the City;
- (5) Evidence that the applicant has sufficient control over the land to undertake the proposed development; and
- (6) Covenants and other restrictions which will be imposed upon the use of the land, Buildings, and Structures, and a copy of any bylaws.

(c) For any development involving the extension of utilities, the owner shall also submit conceptual utility drawings containing the following information:

- (1) The pipe size, slope, manholes and location of the sanitary sewer system;
- (2) The size, shape and slope for all pipes, channels and basins of the storm sewer system with accompanying storm drainage calculations;
- (3) The size and location of water lines and fire hydrants; and
- (4) Street or drive grades, cross sections, elevations and contours at two foot intervals.
- (5) If a conceptual utility plan is required, the applicant shall pay a fee of fifty dollars (\$50.00) per acre for each acre in the development; however, such fee shall not be less than two hundred fifty dollars (\$250.00) for the purposes of reviewing such utility plans.

PUD Procedures:

(a) Pre-application – ***Completed***

(b) Preliminary Plan:

1. Municipal Planning Commission – ***Completed***
2. City Council – ***Completed***

(c) Final Plan:

1. The Municipal Planning Commission shall review Final Plans for compliance with the approved PUD Ordinance and shall:
 - A. Approve the Final Plan as requested;
 - B. Approve the Final Plan with modifications as agreed by the applicant which do not change the essential character of the approved PUD and do not need review by the City Council;
 - C. Recommend the Final Plan to the City Council with changes that require an amendment to the PUD Ordinance; or
 - D. Disapprove the proposed Final Plan when said plan does not meet the requirements of the PUD.

Staff Comments:

Demolition of Buildings:

While staff does not typically support the demolition of contributing buildings in the Worthington Historic District, we believe that the demolition will allow for the overall redevelopment of Stafford Village. City staff previously asked the applicant to look at the possibility of moving the two residential homes to another location, however it was determined to be financially impossible. City staff did ask the applicant to coordinate with the Worthington Historical Society prior to the demolition of the buildings so the Historical Society would have the opportunity to document the existing structures for their records prior to demolition.

Use Considerations:

Senior residential housing is an appropriate use for this site as it is currently being used for the same use and is in close proximity to a grocery store, pharmacy, library, transit, senior center, churches and other amenities in Old Worthington.

Character & Design Considerations:

- The proposed structure is a two-story to three-story structure. The Design Guidelines for new residential and new commercial/industrial recommends buildings should not be higher than 2 ½ stories in height; some instances 2 ½ stories may be appropriate but should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.
 - The current PUD zoning permits a two-story to three-story structure.
- New construction in Old Worthington should employ scale, form, and massing similar to and compatible with existing building designs. Although there are other two to three-story structures in Old Worthington, the residential structures in the immediate vicinity of this project are smaller in scale and height. Kilbourne Middle School, Saint John's Episcopal Church, Huntington Bank and the Old Worthington Library are in the immediate vicinity and are larger in scale and height.
- During the Municipal Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board review process the applicant made design changes in response to comments concerning the overall height:
 - The applicant moved the three-story portion of the building back from Stafford Ave. to the center of the site and lowered the heights and roof lines on the proposed building. The three-story portion previously had hipped roofs and cupolas that have since been removed to bring down the building height.
 - The previous three-story building with a cupola on Stafford Ave. had a height of 53' with a roof ridge of 38.5 and is now reduced to 51.6' with the cupola to a roof ridge of 34.8' in height.
 - The three-story portion of the building previously showed a height of 60' for the cupolas and 39' for the roof ridge. The cupolas on the three-story portions of the building have been removed and the height has been reduced to 36' for the roof ridge.
 - The building setbacks along Hartford St. have increased by 4' to 5' and pushed the building back 40' to 60' around the Sycamore.
- Parking is typically desired to be screened from streets by buildings or landscaping and this proposal provides this screening.
- The amount of proposed onsite parking meets what is required by City Code and would likely be sufficient, however there may still be residents and guests that park along Hartford St. and E. Stafford Ave. near those unit entrances. The proposal provides much more onsite

parking than what is there today, and is expected to alleviate existing parking congestion on Hartford St.

- The public amenities being provided are the following:
 - Courtyards open to the general public (because of their location they may be used more by the residents and those visiting vs. the general public).
 - Decorative lighting
 - Decorative benches and brickwork
 - Decorative bike racks
 - Decorative trashcans
 - New 5' wide sidewalks along the perimeter
 - Additional street trees as needed

Comprehensive Plan Considerations:

- The proposal ties to the Comprehensive Plan objective to promote residential densities around Old Worthington that address targeted housing markets.
- The proposal offers options for residents that would like to stay in Worthington beside staying in their existing single-family home. The proposal provides options for those that wish to rent vs. owning a home. The proposal goes towards Worthington's goal to be a life-span community and provide housing alternatives to its residents across their life. The proposal does not impact the school system with additional children as the proposed project is restricted to Senior Residential restricted to age fifty-five and over. The increase in property taxes would be a net win for the schools as opposed to typical single-family home developments.
- The proposal improves the City's housing balance concerning types of housing available within the City. The project works towards the goals of Worthington becoming a life-span community. It provides a diversity of housing options aimed at empty nesters. There are few opportunities to offer an alternative housing type within Worthington. It provides a housing option that is not necessarily automobile oriented due to its close proximity to a grocery store, pharmacy, library, transit, Griswold Senior Center, churches and other amenities in Old Worthington.
- The proposal meets the location recommended for urban village residential development where non-single-family residential development could occur.
- The proposal meets the location recommended for urban village residential development around Old Worthington. The development complements the character of the area and incorporates the Design Guidelines into the development. The proposal is sensitively placed on the site while respecting existing property rights and neighboring properties while looking at the architecture, site plan and overall design for the project.

Discussion Items:

- Additional information is needed for the windows, exterior doors, garage doors, lighting, porch railings and garage screen. We typically see spec sheets for the materials.
- Sheet D-1
 - Cupola
 - Details needed concerning the materials that will be used for the cupola.
 - Will the cupola be lit at night?
 - Windows

- Roofing
 - Porch Railings
 - What material?
 - Porch Columns
 - Columns should line up with fascia, with capitals extending beyond.
 - Porch Roof
 - Clarification needed on whether the porch roofs will be standing seam or dimensional shingles. It appears to be dimensional shingles.
 - Shutters
 - The windows in the attic area are now shown to not to have shutters.
- Sheet D-2:
 - Shutters
 - The window in the attic area are now shown to not have shutters.
 - Courtyard 2 – West Elevation
 - Windows and doors have slightly changed in location and number.
 - Courtyard 2 – South Elevation
 - Small area on the southern elevation that is now siding that was previously shown as brick.
 - Courtyard 1 – East Elevation
 - Windows and doors have slightly changed in location and number
 - There appears to be a blank area on the east elevation. Clarification is needed on what this is to look like in the future.
 - Courtyard 1 – South Elevation
 - Shows the expanded dining area on the first floor.
 - Courtyard 1 – West Elevation
 - Small area on the western elevation that is now brick that was previously shown as siding.
- Sheet D-3:
 - Partial West Elevation
 - Windows align with the window on the second story balcony.
 - Additional door added along the western elevation.
- Sheet D-4:
 - Hartford Courtyard – West Elevation
 - Windows have been adjusted on the second and third floor.
 - Garage windows/screen
 - Material and color. Details needed.
 - Is it an actual screen or wide open?
 - Hartford Courtyard – North Elevation
 - Small area on the north elevation that is now siding that was previously shown as siding.
 - Should there be a patio door to access the second story balcony?
 - Additional door added to the first-floor porch.
 - Existing house to be painted sporty blue on the original portion of the house with the addition to the rear being painted origami white.
- Sheet D-5:
 - Partial North Elevation

- Additional doors added to the west of the main entrance to the building.
 - There appears to be a blank area on the northern elevation of the first floor with a porch. Clarification is needed on what this is to look like in the future.
 - The attic window above the third-floor balcony is now round vs. previously being shown as a square window.
 - Partial North Elevation
 - Single car garage door added on the northern elevation.
 - Information needed on the materials and look of the proposed garage door.
- Sheet D-6:
 - Partial East Elevation
 - Modifications to the layout of the windows.
 - Partial East Elevation
 - A double car wide garage door was previously shown in this location, there is now a single car garage door.
 - Information needed on the materials and look of the proposed garage door.
 - Paint color changed to reflect the use of Roycroft Vellum (yellow) vs. the previous yellow.
 - Third floor bump out area by the balcony increased.
- Sheet D-7:
 - Products & Materials
 - Roycroft Vellum (yellow) replaced the Rockwood Amber (orange) color.
 - Brick – Type 2 – Brickcraft – Chicago Heritage
 - Examples needed to show what this would look like in the real world.
- Sheet D-8:
 - Porch Columns
 - Columns should line up with fascia, with capitals extending beyond.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of these applications after the ARB & MPC felt all items have been addressed satisfactorily.

Discussion:

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicants, Mr. George Tabit, representing National Church Residences (NCR), and Mr. Brad Poling, from PH7 Architects. Mr. Tabit said he had two short housekeeping items he wanted to discuss. He said while reviewing his files today, he looked over the Affordability Agreement that was prepared by NCR and Worthington’s Law Director, and there were some corrections that are required to assure that the Letter Agreement will be consistent with the intentions they had all agreed to in the course of their approval. Mr. Tabit said what he meant was if you review the recordings of every meeting he participated in, there was an explanation of how the affordability component works. The affordable units would cost approximately \$885.00 dollars per month and the exact amount would be calculated by practices that are well understood

in the affordable housing industry. Mr. Tabit said in reviewing that Agreement today before the meeting, he realized the language relied a little too heavily on the readers familiarity with those rules and someone outside of this world, the language could be misconstrued. He said he had a meeting with the City's Law Director, Mr. Tom Lindsey, and they want to get the language cleared up, including the enforceability provisions. He said his other housekeeping item was to introduce the Architects from PH7. Mr. Tabit said Mr. Poling has been leading the efforts for the past several months. They had a two-year plan in process with an intensive discussion about land use and building design, and the design of the exterior, which was led by Brian Jones, whose firm specializes in those two topics. Mr. Tabit said with City Council's approval earlier this year for the PUD Ordinance, they turn away from the land use issues and building exterior design issues that Mr. Jones had listened to throughout all the meetings. He incorporated what everyone wanted and started focusing on the very fine details such as brick colors, and the selection of tree species. Mr. Tabit said they were very glad to have PH7 on board, they are a well-known architectural firm located in Columbus, and are recognized nationally as a leader in senior housing. They also made sure the sanitary sewer would not impact the trees they worked so hard to save. Mr. Brown mentioned to the Chair that Mr. Lindsey, the City's Law Director, was also online at the virtual meeting and available for questions. Mr. Tabit said if everything moves forward, they plan to start construction at the beginning of the New Year.

Mr. Tabit turned the discussion over to Mr. Poling. Mr. Brown said they had a discussion with Mr. Tabit and Mr. Poling regarding the hours of construction at the site, and what they have done in the past with other development sites, is allowing construction to be done during the 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. time frame, however, they do realize things may ebb and flow with those time frames. He said if there was a need to go beyond those hours, he asked the construction team to reach out to the neighboring property owners ahead of time to let them know what was going on, for example, such as a concrete pour at 5:30 a.m.

Mr. Brown said he also wanted to go on record about the conversations concerning the improvements to Kilbourne Middle School. Mr. Brown said Mr. Tabit has been involved with the coordination of the schools and both entities are aware they both have projects going on.

Mr. Foust said earlier in the year after City Council passed the Ordinance, he spoke with representative Scott Myers about his yes vote, and they came to the conclusion that he may have some helpful input during the meeting. Mr. Foust said Mr. Myers primary reason for approving this from City Council was because of the Council's or the City's pledge to support projects that involved additional senior housing. He said his question to Mr. Myers was if that were the case, then would that carry over to the ARB and MPC and how they review this. Mr. Foust asked Mr. Myers for clarification.

Mr. Myers said in support of this proposal before City Council, they were asked to rezone the property to a PUD. He said if you look at Section 1174.01 and 1174.03, which is both the purpose provision and one of the implementation provisions of the PUD Ordinance, it specifically allows or sets out that a PUD is different than straight zoning in that it provides for an expanded view of what is permissible on that property. Mr. Myers quoted, "A mix of uses is necessary to meet changing economic and demographic demands; permits implementation of development standards, plans, studies, and guidelines adopted by the City Council." He said he interpreted that

the PUD can be used to alter the mix of uses and the permitted uses of that property but they can also use it as a way to implement policy guidelines that City Council would like to see implemented. One of those policies that City Council enacted during the pendency of this process, was that they adopted an age friendly community resolution. Therefore, City Council has adopted as a policy and that they would do what they could to encourage the implementation of policies and planning that would promote, including housing, at all ranges of the age spectrum. Mr. Myers said he did not feel that it would impose an absolute duty on the Municipal Planning Commission (MPC) but it adds another factor that MPC should consider when looking at a PUD. City Council has expressed that they would like to see these projects go forward. If MPC believes that it fits then that would be a way to implement City Council's policy. Mr. Myers said he believed, given this circumstance, this project does implement City Council's policy and he believed this was something City Council wanted to see happen and that is why there was a favorable result for the rezoning.

Mr. Schuster asked Mr. Tabit for clarification as to the figure of affordability. Mr. Schuster said Mr. Tabit said in previous meetings that the affordable rent rate would be \$800.00 a month and now Mr. Tabit is saying the affordable rate would be \$885.00 dollars per month. Mr. Tabit said the basis for computing the amount is the area median income for the Central Ohio metropolitan statistical area and that number goes up because incomes go up every year. Mr. Schuster said of the tenants that were there previously, could they actually afford \$885.00 dollars a month? Mr. Tabit said of the residents that left and that want to come back, they will be offered whatever their rent rate was. Mr. Tabit said that computation is a standard that HUD uses to determine affordability. Mr. Schuster said he did a search online of what the market rate was for apartments and the going rate, not including downtown Columbus, Ohio, but the average rent was between \$900.00 and \$1,000.00 dollars a month, and that was not much different than the rate being offered as an "affordable" rate.

Mr. Tabit said they were before the Board to consider their Final Development Plan and he wanted to make sure that they had time to do that and is it consistent with the PUD. He said he also wanted to talk about the details of the architecture and their Certificate of Appropriateness Mr. Tabit said he did not know what Mr. Schuster had looked at, but the NCR apartments will be inclusive of utilities and some of the other amenities.

Mr. Reis said he wanted to thank Mr. Brown and Mrs. Bitar for all their work and Mr. Brown's comments this evening, and Mr. Myers clarification of City Council's position on this. He felt this project is very important to a segment of the community in the City of Worthington. Mr. Reis said the amount of work that has been done on the project by both of the Boards, City Council, and members of the community and National Church Residences (NCR), and all of their consultants, has been monumental. He felt this project was very appropriate for the City of Worthington, and he looks forward to them continuing and getting the project finished up.

Mr. Hofmann said he had a question about the courtyards off Stafford Avenue and they seemed to be more refined. He asked for clarification about the changes. Mr. Tabit said they brought in the Edge group to help them refine those intimate spaces. He said the courtyard to the west has a couple of benches and then leads to a series of patio entrances to the various apartments. They used plantings to create buffer zones from the entrances. Mr. Tabit said the other courtyard had a

little bit of different feel and that is probably where more people would gather. Mr. Hofmann said he areas were thoughtfully done, but he would like to see more places for people to sit, like more pockets with benches. Mr. Coulter said he appreciated the drawing showing where the mechanicals were going to go.

Mrs. Bitar said the Board had received several emails and those emails were posted to the City's website. She said Mr. Michael Ball sent a second email stating that the plans still looked great and this will be a great asset to the community, and he hoped this would be approved. Mrs. Bitar said she also received an email from Mr. Robinson with the following questions:

"I have two questions:

1) Also, Mr. Tabot, in his opening remarks, stated that "Clean up" work was needed for the affordability agreement. Please explain in detail. What is the discrepancy between what Mr. Tabot called shared intent and current language?

2) Also, I asked the City (Mr. Brown) today the following question today, related to the terms of the affordability agreement: What is 60% of current monthly AMI? For individual, and for couple?

The answer provided was: "The 2020 Income in the Franklin County MSA for a 1-person household earning 60% of the area median is \$35,400. For a 2-person household that number would be \$40,440."

Based on this information, it appears monthly rent would be significantly higher than \$885 if I understand the affordability agreement properly and the info provided by the city. For example, $\$35,400/12 = \$2,950$. Or if the information provided meant \$35,400 as AMI, then 60% would be \$21,240, and divided by 12 would be \$1,770.

How does this reconcile with the \$885 that Mr. Tabot cited?

Mr. Tabit said Mr. Robinson's email was correct about the need for cleaning up the Affordability Agreement, and that the Agreement was poorly written and needs a little work. He said when properly drafted, you should be able to quickly compute the figures, and he trusts the attorney to take another shot at it. Mr. Lindsey said the definition of affordable housing that was in the document is only half of the correct definition. He said the Agreement was originally drafted by Mr. Hodge at the request of NCR. Mr. Lindsey said he did not catch it either. He said it is the half amount that determines what the income amount is but then the affordable housing standard use is 30% of that income amount. The language that they need to clean up before execution is to add the 30% language. Mr. Lindsey said he would take care of that with Mr. Hodge. He said Mr. Tabit brought that to his attention earlier in the day and he said he felt comfortable moving forward with that change. The change will be a benefit to the City. Mr. Tabit said he would look forward to the clarifying information.

Mrs. Bitar said there no other emails, but there were a few callers that wanted to speak.

Mr. Tom Burns, 1006 Kilbourne Dr., Worthington, Ohio, said he wanted to give kudos to City Staff for all of their hard work on this project, and he also thanked Mr. Tabit and his team for their hard work on this project. Mr. Burns said he was very excited that this project is moving forward and he was happy to hear City Staff's detailed presentation about safety issues. This is housing for older adults and very important to make sure there is emergency access. Mr. Burns said he did not believe the City of Worthington staff had any experts that could determine the rate of what affordable housing should be, but he was in favor of the project.

Mrs. Holcombe said she wanted to hear more details about the two new light poles and if the lights would be shielded, and if the light source would affect the neighboring properties. Mr. Poling said the lights would be shielded. Mr. Coulter said the city would prefer the LED lights to be of a warm color.

Mrs. Bitar swore in Mr. Blair Davis, 1 Hartford Ct., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Davis said he had a question about the lights because his house will be facing the new development. He asked about the porch lights for the apartments and Mr. Brown explained what fixtures would be used and that the porch lights would be recessed.

Ms. Hinz asked if the lights would be on constantly or if the lights would only be on for a certain amount of time. Mr. Poling said the lights would be on from sunset to sunrise, but the lights can be controlled if necessary. The lights are for the safety of staff and visitors that come at nighttime.

ARB Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY PH7 ARCHITECTS ON BEHALF OF NATIONAL CHURCH RESIDENCES FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO DEMOLISH THE EXISTING BUILDINGS AND REDEVELOP THE PROPERTY AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF HARTFORD ST. AND E. STAFFORD AVE., AS PER CASE NO. AR 14-2019 DRAWINGS NO. AR 14-2019, DATED JULY 10, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING AND THAT THE NEW LIGHT POLES WILL HAVE APPROPRIATE SHIELDS TO REDUCE ANY DIRECT LIGHT SOURCES.

Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Foust, nay. He said he supported senior housing in Worthington, but felt the beautiful building was too large for the site and he does not feel that the building fits the character of the neighborhood; Mr. Schuster, nay, for the same reasons stated by Mr. Foust; Ms. Hinz, aye; Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

PUD Final Plan – MPC Motion:

Mr. Reis moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY PH7 ARCHITECTS ON BEHALF OF NATIONAL CHURCH RESIDENCES FOR APPROVAL OF THE PUD FINAL PLAN TO REDEVELOP THE PROPERTY AT NORTHEAST CORNER OF HARTFORD ST. AND E. STAFFORD

AVE., AS PER CASE NO. PUD 01-2019F, DRAWINGS NO. PUD 01-2019F, DATED JULY 10, 2020, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE PLANNING GOALS OF THE CITY, AS REFERENCED IN THE LAND USE PLANS AND ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Hofmann seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Foust, nay, for the same reasons stated previously; Mr. Hofmann; aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

2. Subdivision

- a. Stafford Village Redevelopment – **Northeast Corner of Hartford St. and Stafford Ave.**
(National Church Residences) **SUB 01-2020**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of Fact & Conclusions

Background & Request:

To accommodate the redevelopment of Stafford Village, the property must be combined into one parcel. The Preliminary and Final Plats are included in this request.

Project Details:

1. The applicant will be combining ten (10) separate parcels to create one new parcel. The proposed development was designed as though the parcels were already combined. Sheets C-1 to C-3 show existing and proposed conditions as required in the Preliminary Plat.
2. As part of the redevelopment process the owner will be vacating an existing 12” sanitary sewer line and platting a new 12” sanitary sewer line in a 20’ easement as shown on the subdivision plat.

Land Use Plans

Worthington Subdivision Regulations

“Subdivision” means the division or combination of any parcel or parcels of land shown as a unit or as contiguous units on the latest tax roll.

Section 1101.09 Preliminary Plat Contents and Section 1101.12 Final Plat Contents outline the necessary information required to consider an application complete to be approved by the Municipal Planning Commission and be sent to City Council for final approval.

Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of this request as all standards for review have been met.

Motion:

Mr. Hofmann moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY NATIONAL CHURCH RESIDENCES TO COMBINE PROPERTIES, VACATE AN EXISTING SANITARY SEWER EASEMENT AND PLAT A NEW SANITARY SEWER EASEMENT AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF HARTFORD ST. AND E. STAFFORD AVE. AS PART OF THE REDEVELOPMENT OF STAFFORD VILLAGE AS PER CASE NO. SUB 01-2020, DRAWINGS NO. SUB 01-2020, DATED JULY 10, 2020, BE RECOMMENDED TO CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mrs. Holcombe seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mrs. Holcombe, aye; Mr. Foust, nay; Mr. Hofmann, aye; Mr. Reis, aye; and Mr. Coulter, aye. The motion was approved.

E. Other

Mr. Brown reminded the ARB-MPC will be recessed for the month of August, and the next meeting will be on September 10, 2020.

F. Adjournment

Mr. Hofmann moved to adjourn the meeting, and Mr. Reis seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the meeting adjourned at 9:36 p.m.